



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,288	12/14/2006	James C. Jamieson	R131 1010.1	2936
26158	7590	08/12/2009	EXAMINER	
WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC			KIM, TAEYOON	
ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING				
P.O. BOX 7037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30357-0037			1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/582,288	JAMIESON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAEYOON KIM	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 31,32,35,36 and 39-54 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39-54 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 31,32,35 and 36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/18/06</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 31, 32, 35 and 36), and species of GABARAP and hypercholesterolemia in the reply filed on 6/8/2009 is acknowledged.

Claims 39-54 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected subject matter. Claims 31, 32, 35 and 36 have been considered on the merits.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 12/18/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Applicant indicated that the submitted CD contained references listed in the IDS filed on 12/18/2006.

M.P.E.P. §609.04(a)(II)(D) states "A CD cannot be used to submit an IDS listing or copies of the documents cited in the IDS."

Claim Objections

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: There is a typographical error in "Class III PI3 lunase". It appears to be "Class III PI3 kinase" instead. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities: The instant claim discloses a Markush type species. M.P.E.P. §2173.05(h) states "Alternative expressions are

permitted if they present no uncertainty or ambiguity with respect to the question of scope or clarity of the claims. One acceptable form of alternative expression, which is commonly referred to as a Markush group, recites members as being “selected from the group consisting of A, B and C.” See *Ex parte Markush*, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The current application generically claims any autophagocytosis inducing compound, however the specification does not contain an adequate description for the entire scope of this limitation and thus the claims. The claims are not limited to a particular species just generically any autophagocytosis inducing compound which is known in the art and those which have not been isolated and/or identified including variants of known species. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical

properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. See Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d at 1568,43 USPQ2d at 1406.

The claims are essentially of limitless breadth. It is implied that so long as the specification provides one with the ability to test any particular embodiment which is encompassed by the material limitations of a claim, one can thereby distinguish between those embodiments which meet the functional limitations from those embodiments which don't. This argument is not entirely without merit. However, the issue here is the breadth of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level of the artisan and the guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. This 'make and test' position is inconsistent with the decisions in *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833,166

The claims imply that other autophagocytosis inducing compound with the claim-designated properties can be found using the method disclosed in the specification without undue experimentation. Whether or not the disclosure provides an enabling disclosure, it does not provide a written description of the desired genus which is necessary to provide a written description of the claimed genus. Every species in a genus need not be described in order that a genus meets the written description requirement. See Utter, 845 F.2d at 998- 99,6 USPQ2d at 1714 ("A specification may, within the meaning of §112, first paragraph, contain a written description of a broadly claimed invention without describing all species that claim encompasses.") In claims to a species from a genus, however, a generic statement without more,

is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the claimed species of the genus from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the genus does, rather than what it is. See *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1169-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1605-06 (discussing Amgen). It is only a definition of a useful result rather than a definition of what achieves that result. Many such species of the genus may achieve that result. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369,372- 73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally thought to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that entire material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 31, 32, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Eulenberg et al. (WO 03/066086; IDS ref.).

Eulenberg et al. teach a method of using GABARAP to treat metabolic disorders including hypercholesterolemia (p.1, 1st par.). Eulenberg et al. also teach dosage and administration of GAARAP being adjusted to provide sufficient levels of the active moiety or to maintain the desired effect, and the range of dosage amounts varying from 0.1 to 100,000 micrograms, up to a total dose of about 1 g (p.37), thus meets the limitation of therapeutically effective amount. Furthermore, in the absence of specific dosage range disclosed in the specification, applicant would appear to suggest that any amount of an autophagocytosis inducing compound would treat at least to some degree, and thus, the limitation of therapeutically effective amount is interpreted as any amount.

With regard to the intended results of reducing serum levels of triglycerides or VLDL (claim 31), Eulenberg et al. do not particularly teach serum levels of triglycerides or VLDL being reduced by the method. However, since Eulenberg et al. teach that GABARAP regulates the metabolism of triglycerides (abstract), and the method steps of Eulenberg et al. is the same as the claimed method steps, the method of Eulenberg et al. inherently produces the same effect as in the current application.

The discovery of a new use for an old structure based on unknown properties of the structure *might* be patentable to the discoverer as a process of using. *In re Hack*, 245 F.2d 246, 248, 114 USPQ 161, 163 (CCPA 1957). However, when the claim recites using an old composition or structure and the "use" is directed to a result or property of that composition or structure, then the claim is anticipated. *In re May*, 574 F.2d 1082, 1090, 197 USPQ 601, 607 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Tomlinson*, 363 F.2d 928, 150 USPQ 623 (CCPA 1966). See M.P.E.P. § 2112.02.

Thus, the reference anticipates the claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAEYOON KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-9041. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm ET (Mon-Thu).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Taeyoon Kim/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651